

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Eric S. Raymond <esr@locke.ccil.org>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 4:40pm
Subject: Open Letter to the FCC Commissioners on RM 8775

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Honorable Commissioners:

I write to you today as an Internet user of twenty years' standing and an Internet technologist, one of the technical people who help make the Internet culture work and have worked hardest to bring its benefits to ordinary people. To learn about my Internet-access projects and their fruits, I invite you to browse my Web page at <http://www.ccil.org/~esr>.

I write to state that I am appalled that the FCC is even considering action on the ACTA petition designated as RM8775, re Internet Net-Phone technology.

I have no stake in any Net-Phone service. I've never used a net-phone. I am, in economic terms, a wholly disinterested party. But I cannot stand idly by while ACTA argues for the suppression and regulatory strangulation of an entire class of technologies to protect the profit margins of its members, adding insult to injury by cloaking this self-serving manipulation in a hypocritical appeal to the "public" interest.

Where would we be today if, in 1896, the manufacturers of buggy whips had banded together to petition the government to keep the infant technology of the automobile off U.S. roads, lest it imperil the economic position of the carriage-making industry?

Considering the growth of U.S. population and travel since then, the proper answer is probably "knee deep in horseshit". Which phrase eloquently expresses the way I felt after having read the ACTA petition.

In the remainder of this letter, I shall demolish ACTA's special pleading point by point, then turn to some more general but very relevant considerations regarding Internet regulation.
The myth of "free service".

First, ACTA submits "that it is not in the public interest to permit long distance service to be given away, depriving those who must maintain the telecommunications infrastructure of the revenue to do so".

No one is proposing that long-distance service be "given away"; users of net-phones will still pay the cost of their Internet connections to Internet service providers, who will have every incentive to "maintain the telecommunications infrastructure" because that's what ISPs use, too.

Transparently, what ACTA really objects to is the inevitable shift of customer choice and revenues away from time-metered service over voice circuits protected by regulatory barriers to entry, and towards a wide-open free market in flat-rate Internet connections carrying voice, data and multimedia communications at lower cost than ACTA's members can offer. No construction of the "public interest" can justify attempting to thwart this natural evolution.

ACTA's invocation of existing regulation ignores its goals.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

ACTA continues "nor is it in the public interest for these select telecommunications carriers to operate outside the regulatory requirements applicable to all other carriers." In making this argument, ACTA blatantly ignores the goals of the regulations that it cites so piously.

47 U.S.C. Sections 203 and 214 set up as a public-policy objective the encouragement of cheap universal telecommunications service. The continuing development of a robust, market-driven Internet supporting lower-cost universal voice communications among its many other facilities is clearly in the public interest defined by cited statute.

ACTA's attempt to protect the profit margins of its members by coercive regulatory fiat amounts to a form of market-rigging, and is just as clearly against that public interest.

All other FCC regulations and statutes pursuant to 47 U.S.C 203/214 are mere mechanics pursuant to these public-policy objectives, and provide no independent grounds for satisfying ACTA's oligopolistic desires.

The bogus "threat" to customary Internet traffic.

ACTA continues: "The misuse of the Internet as a way to bypass the traditional means of obtaining long distance service could result in a significant reduction of the Internet's ability to handle the customary types of Internet traffic."

These crocodile tears for "customary" traffic are unconvincing even as a narrow technical objection. ACTA knows full well that Internet and voice traffic now use essentially the same inter-LATA infrastructure of 56K and higher-capacity digital connections. The complete replacement of voice inter-LATA calls by net-phone connections would therefore not imply contention for separate Internet capacity, but merely a customer-driven reallocation of fungible existing capacity. It would have marginal or zero effect on "customary" traffic.

ACTA's real concern is that said customer-driven reallocation would force them out of high-margin voice business into low-margin packet-transfer business. Absent a solid finding that packet-transfer profit margins could not sustain the telecommunications infrastructure, this concern is no business of the FCC's. And no such finding could possibly be justified as long as carriers are seeking Internet customers in order to make a profit on them!
False analogy to finite radio spectrum.

ACTA attempts to buttress the preceding "crowding-out" argument by analogizing Internet capacity to the radio spectrum. The petition continues: "The Commission has historically protected the public interest by allocating finite communications resources/frequencies and organizing communications traffic."

Developing new radio spectrum (or tighter modulation techniques for old spectrum) is expensive and difficult. Internet capacity is cheap and easy to build, almost absurdly so -- indeed, the low cost of additional bandwidth is the economic root of the threat ACTA perceives. While both are technically finite, the difference in incremental cost of developing new bandwidth is so great that to analogize Internet capacity to scarce radio-spectrum space is

transparently nonsense.

The FCC has no mission to allocate Internet bandwidth because the public need for growth in Internet bandwidth is being effectively served by the market. ACTA's argument on this specific amounts to a groundless plea that the FCC ignore economic facts.

Appeal to "tariffs concerning unlawful uses".

ACTA completes its wretched exercise in special pleading with a flourish of humbug by appealing to the FCC's duty to suppress unlawful uses such as "gambling, obscenity, prostitution, drug traffic, and other illegal acts."

Suppose we agree to leave aside both the doubtful enforceability of such regulations even in existing media and the dubious constitutionality of those relating at least to victimless crimes. ACTA's argument is nevertheless flawed. It amounts specifically to a call for enforcement of standards against net-phone users which (by assumption of the argument) would not be enforced against the same users engaging in non-voice communication of the same material, even over the same portions of telecommunications infrastructure!

Constitutional case law strenuously prohibits the Federal government from underbroad regulation of this kind. Either the FCC's responsibility requires it to attempt to control all Internet speech relating to "gambling, obscenity, prostitution, drug traffic, and other illegal acts", or the FCC is absolved from attempting to duplicate the functions of the FBI, DEA and BATF because the Internet as a whole is impractical to police.

An attempt at selective regulation against net-phone users would constitute a forbidden discrimination between classes of speakers. Nor is this merely a theoretical point -- does the FCC really want to invite suit against net-phone regulation under the equal-protection clause by advocates for the blind?

Morally, ACTA's posturing as a would-be defender of "family values" in pursuit of its narrow economic interests is perhaps the most contemptible single tactical maneuver in this petition. It is crass and cynical and ultimately rather pathetic.

(This completes the rebuttal of ACTA's arguments. Points following are general challenges not specifically related to the particulars of RM8775.)

Net-phone regulation would be unenforceable

Net-phone technology is primarily software. The hardware (microphones and speakers) necessary to capture and relay voice communications is already ubiquitous on personal computers for other reasons. The algorithms required to compress and packetize speech are well-known and implementations are widely available as free software. The hardware assistance provided by some commercial net-phone products is useful but by no means essential.

It follows that hypothetical FCC prohibitions or restrictions on net-phone technology would be unenforceable. Locking out commercial products would merely hand development of net-phones to a technology underground, and brokering of net-phone time to a black market. This could lead to all the bad consequences we are familiar with from other kinds of prohibition.

Net-phone regulation would be rejected by the Internet culture

The FCC must be aware that, more than other media, the Internet plays host to many communities of interest; further, that the Internet itself is no tabula rasa passively awaiting guidance but a huge community of interests with its own traditions, shared values, and attitudes. As the present maintainer of the Jargon File (<http://www.ccil.org/jargon>), a widely-recognized and even venerated compendium of Internet folklore, I can speak with some authority on the substance of these values.

I am confident that most informed Internet users share my rejection of ACTA's arguments and my passion for a free and diverse Internet supporting an unfettered free market in net-phones and all the other kinds of services we can conceive and build. Among Internet technologists and other core members of the culture, I predict that virtually all will reject net-phone regulation.

Indeed, many Internetters would regard the undermining of such regulation (and all other regulation that in their view threatens free expression on the net) as a semi-obligatory form of civil disobedience, a positive duty in defense of liberty.

In support of this perhaps startling assertion, I suggest the FCC consider the nearly universal popular support on the Internet for campaigns of active civil disobedience against the regulations on export of cryptographic "munitions" and against the Communications Decency Act.

The implication that the net would also actively resist the FCC content regulation incidentally called for in the ACTA petition is intended. As one of our tribal elders once observed, "The Internet interprets censorship as damage and routes around it."

Net-phone regulation would be rejected by a broad majority of voice users

As the Internet become more ubiquitous, packet-traffic costs drop, and the margins between net-phone rates and voice tariffs rise, users of voice telecommunications will experience steadily increasing incentives to flout FCC's net-phone regulations and escape FCC tariff structures.

In the absence of either totalitarian force majeure or a widely-accepted ethical argument to justify FCC regulation, these pressures will certainly prove irresistible. No one wants the former and ACTA has not supplied and will not supply the latter.

Net-phone regulation would, therefore, eventually collapse politically as well as technologically.

Harm from attempted suppression or regulation.

Before the collapse, net-phone regulation would inflict much harm.

- * Economic harm to consumers, by requiring them to buy inter-LATA voice services at higher cost than offered by net-phones.

- * Economic harm to investors and businesses, by encouraging malinvestment in obsolete voice-only equipment and voice-carrier organizations.

- * Harm to the authority of the FCC and the U.S. Government pursuant

to any decision to enforce bad regulations and unpopular law.

* Harm to the civil fabric and the respect for rule of law, from causes similar to but more general than the foregoing.
In conclusion...

Neither ACTA nor the FCC (assuming it is so minded) can turn back the technological tide. Net-phone regulation cannot be ethically justified, would be popularly rejected, and eventually would not stand. While in force, it would inflict substantial harm on the American public and body politic.

I therefore urge the Commissioners to reject the ACTA petition. I further urge that the Commissioner's refusal express the sense that the FCC will not in future entertain petitions for declaratory rulings or rulemaking premised on an Internet threat to the profits of older media.

(The entire text of this letter has been made available on the World Wide Web at <http://www.ccil.org/~esr/netfreedom/acta.html>)

Sincerely
Eric S. Raymond

CC: A17.A17(kwerbach)

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

From: <mbrown@steps.atsi.edu>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/27/96 10:20am
Subject: ACTA's Petition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Sirs,

The recent petition to limit/restrict interactive training and education on the internet could spell doom for millions of underskilled workers. Currently, there are numerous Business, Industry, & Government (BIG) projects in various development cycles that require the use of interactive technologies on the internet and intranet. Currently, organizations can and do use their intranets to distribute voice and video applications. A move by the FCC to restrict smaller firms, agencies, etc. of the internet for the same applications would quickly limit competition in electronic commerce and would create an economy of the "haves" and "have nots". The internet represents a tool/vehicle of hope for those that have none. Training and educational material linked to the emerging National Skill Standards Board (NSSB) initiatives rely upon the internet to distribute applications. Most applications are in a computer-mediated-communication (CMC) mode at the present, but, are migrating to the higher end video and voice applications. Again, a restriction from such activity would be limiting.

please consider these thoughts

Michael L. Brown, American Training Standards Institute
P.O. Box 310, Waxahachie, Texas 75165 voice: 214-923-1663 fax: 214-923-1666
E-mail: mbrown@atsi.edu 03/27/96 07:20:24

Skill Standards Homepage: <http://steps.atsi.edu>
Building The Standard: One Skill At A Time

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Roger Westergren <row@mail.algonet.se>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/25/96 5:39pm
Subject: RM No. 8775 - a europeans point of view

Hello,

the ACTA petition to regulate Internet phone software in the US has had some negative press in Europe. The Internet, though from the beginning an american initiative, is today a worldwide organism, growing at a breathtaking pace.

Most lists, programs, news groups etc. are still american, thereby demonstrating the superiority of its place of origin. Attempts to regulate the development of new technology, like von software, will most probably result in a divided Internet, where development of new software will take place outside of the US.

A good example is SpeakFreely, a multiplatform von program, currently released in Switzerland. Another example is Internet phone, whose owners are already to a large extent established in Israel.

As a Swedish citizen I am amazed at what takes place in the US. Many europeans have believed that free speech was "holy" in the US. Now we see that this is not so. The Internet itself has been regulated by the presidents decision and now we see how telephone companies try to stop a developing technology.

The ban on pgp made people in Europe start using pgp. It is freely available at many sites, despite the export ban. This will also be the case with all phone programs, should they be forbidden in the US:

Many greetings

Roger

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

From: <lakers96@laintet.com>
To: A4.A4(ssegal)
Date: 3/27/93 1:31am
Subject: Concerned remarks regarding "Net Phone"

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Please dont allow Corporate America to sell out the Citizens of America!

Do all you can do to not only laugh in the face of the telecommunications companies that have discovered that we citizens no longer need their services, but also help the new technology "Internet Phone" by assisting the software companies that are creating the most innovative technological advance since Thomas Edison created the phone. I have family in Europe and we talk all the time using the program "Net Phone" for the price of a local call. In its current form "Net Phone", is like a CB radio making it so you press a button to talk and release it to hear the other person. It doesnt even require a fast modem a 14.4 baud modem will do. By giving in to the noticeably upset Telecommunications

Lobby you are selling short your Employer, The American Tax Payer and Voter. Allow us to enter the next century with technology and services for all at a HONEST price, free!!

That the FCC has made the date for this hearing so soon shows that by all odds The Communications Lobby has already signed your check, but who is it that really signs your check?

Its me and I say No to Corporate Big Brother regulating technology to turn free cyberspace into a telephone long distance toll ripoff! Its my country and Were free here so dont tread me.

Sincerely from the bottom of my cyber Heart

Jason de Cordoba

Registered Voter (Voted Today as a matter of fact)

(310) 459-2578 if you need any clarification on the Bill of Rights and the Constitution feel free to call and ask

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

From: Eric Anderson <crusader@MO.NET>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 1:06am
Subject: Informal Comment on the ACTA Petition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I ask that the FCC consider the facts in the Internet telephony issue. There is no difference if people transmit data in text or by voice on the Internet. The ACTA claim that voice on the net is a "misuse" is untrue and is totally unsubstantiated. The fact is that Internet bandwidth increases constantly because new users are paying their provider to access the net. The long distance companies should not be allowed to have a monopoly on interstate voice communication. In addition, the idea of classifying Internet Service Providers as long distance phone companies is absurd. If this is done, it would stunt the growth of the Internet and seriously cripple it as a viable communications medium. Please stop this insanity and deny the petition of the ACTA.

Thank you.

Copies rec'd _____ /
ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

From: <Lythande@ecrknox.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 2:26am
Subject: ACTA Petition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

You know, we know, and we _know_ you know that ACTA is ***NOT*** acting in any way, shape, or form to protect the interests of consumers, but to protect the interests of their own wallets. They even as much as *say* so in their "petition" by citing that the use of these devices allows consumers to "bypass" conventional methods and "avoid long distance charges". They are acting on their own interests only, and if you allow them to win, then it is WELL KNOWN that you are only acting on your own interests as well to gain that all-mighty Tax Dollar.

You already are, by not allowing the people this ruling will most affect to "formally" respond using their most common media -- email. Maybe you consider this "informal," but I am _extremely_ formal about this.

Lythande lythande@ecrknox.com
Tammy A. Skidmore
P.O. Box 295
Gambier, OH 43022-0295

Why is it that some politicians define "democracy" as a government in which "the people" elect those that they wish to "RULE" them???

Number of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Lynwood Hines ATG <hines@rassp1.scra.org>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/25/96 11:55pm
Subject: Reference: RM No. 8775

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DO NOT REGULATE THE INTERNET!

Note that I do not work for a company that produces a product that uses the Internet for audio or video transmission, nor do I have any vested interest in such a company. I simply feel that regulation of the Internet in any way is fundamentally destructive, unwarranted, and inappropriate.

Fundamentally, a data packet is just that; a data packet. The bits it contains may be part of a sampled, digitized audio signal, or they may represent characters of an email message, or any number of different things. I feel very strongly that the SEMANTIC interpretation of a cluster of bits does not represent a basis for regulation or taxation.

In addition, such regulation is virtually unenforceable, and therefore meaningless. How is a sniffer going to determine if a cluster of bits represent part of an audio signal, a video signal, an email message, etc.? One argument would be that, since the UDP protocol is typically used for audio/video signals, you could simply detect (and regulate) the use of UDP packets. As soon as you do something like this, smart people developing Internet collaboration tools (i.e. Voice On the Net

(VON) products) will cloak their data in TCP (or other) packets.

Alternatively, your sniffer could look at ALL packets and apply pattern matching algorithms to determine the probability that a packet represents part of an audio or video signal (assuming such an approach is practical, which is a very big assumption). Then, you could regulate packets with greater than some percentage of probability (imagine what the fights to determine what a "fair" percentage of probability would be like! They would be ongoing as long as the regulation is on the books!). But VON developers can get around this as well, by simply garbling the audio/video signal, thereby rendering the pattern recognition ineffective.

Fundamentally, implementation of any form of regulation of Internet audio/video is impossible; you will simply start the equivalent of an arms race between regulators and regulatees, which will benefit no one, including the telecom companies supporting the ACTA petition.

Therefore, I urge you to reject ACTA's attempts at regulation of the Internet.

Regards,

Lynwood E. Hines
Senior Engineer hines@scra.org

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Roger Westergren <row@mail.algonet.se>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/25/96 5:39pm
Subject: RM No. 8775 - a europeans point of view

Hello,

the ACTA petition to regulate Internet phone software in the US has had some negative press in Europe. The Internet, though from the beginning an american initiative, is today a worldwide organism, growing at a breathtaking pace.

Most lists, programs, news groups etc. are still american, thereby demonstrating the superiority of its place of origin. Attempts to regulate the development of new technology, like von software, will most probably result in a divided Internet, where development of new software will take place outside of the US.

A good example is SpeakFreely, a multiplatform von program, currently released in Switzerland. Another example is Internet phone, whose owners are already to a large extent established in Israel.

As a Swedish citizen I am amazed at what takes place in the US. Many europeans have believed that free speech was "holy" in the US. Now we see that this is not so. The Internet itself has been regulated by the presidents decision and now we see how telephone companies try to stop a developing technology.

The ban on pgp made people in Europe start using pgp. It is freely available at many sites, despite the export ban. This will also be the case with all phone programs, should they be forbidden in the US:

Many greetings

Roger

No. of Copies rec'd 1
LIST ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

From: Dale Thompson <drt@sashimi.wwa.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 7:22am
Subject: ACTA Petition Comments

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

There are so many analogies and reasons why this is an absurd petition, it is difficult to know where to start. This country has recently decried the censorship of the internet by China and Singapore. If this petition was sponsored in a 3rd world dictatorship it would be view as nothing more than what it is. A vested interest trying to preserve its monopoly. It would be as if the railroads tried to stop trucks from shipping freight over the highways. Yes, it certainly will cut into their business but is healthier for the economy, the country and the free enterprise principles by which we live.

This use of the technology is simply an evolution and trying to stop it before it is fully explored is wrong.

Dale Thompson
Telex Communications

Dale Thompson	Tel: 847-945-8112
Telex Communications	Fax: 847-945-8116
1032 Oxford Road	Email: drt@wwa.com
Deerfield, IL 60015 USA	

Number of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

From: Gary Croll, (KE6GHS) U.C. Riverside <croll@ucrac1.ucr.edu>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("hm8775")
Date: 3/26/96 1:05pm
Subject: Voice on the Net

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

The Internet has spawned a huge surge in learning, research, and basic communications. Such a simple thing as tracking down a long lost friend or relative has brought pleasure to thousands. The possibilities for the internet are limitless, but only if it is left intact. Just because some phone companies think they're losing money, is no justification to dismantle or strangle with regulation, an emerging technology. The Internet has become a huge success, all without the "help" of the FCC.

The average person is not going to abandon their conventional phone for an Internet phone. While the idea of stiffing the phone company is appealing to many, the reality is only a few people will tolerate the expense, inconvenience, and poor quality of the "free" phone call. Fewer people still, will want to tie up their computer to make a call.

I don't have an Internet phone, nor do I intend to get one, but I don't think this is something the FCC should be concerned with. Let the marketplace drive the success or failure of the idea, not some federal regulation.

respectfully,
Gary Croll

Gary Croll (KE6GHS)
University of California, Riverside
(909) 787-3041 Fax (909) 787-7282 gary.croll@ucr.edu

CC: A16.A16(rm8775)

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Burt Holzman <bholzm1@icarus.cc.uic.edu>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 3:18pm
Subject: RM8775

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

To whom it may concern:

(I'm not sure if comments from ordinary citizens is what the FCC solicits; if not, then please forward this to the appropriate place.)

I read about the ACTA suit in the newspaper the other day and find it absolutely ludicrous. It appears that big business is attempting to quash digital telephony. Now there's an effective and relatively inexpensive way to talk to people around the world, and the phone companies want to shut it down. What's next? The US Post Office declaring e-mail to be unfair to their business?

Thank you.

Burt Holzman
(I am not affiliated in any way with ACTA or VON).

Number of Copies rec'd
1-1 ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Ira Brickman <brickman@i-2000.com>
To: 'rm8775@fcc.gov' <rm8775@fcc.gov>
Date: 3/26/96 3:21pm
Subject: RM No. 8775

It is my understanding that ACTA has petitioned the FCC to regulate CONTENT (telephony software) on the Internet.

I wish to comment strongly AGAINST any decision which would infringe on the naturally-occurring events to date. Simply put, if ACTA member companies had the vision to develop the software first, then I have no doubt they would be arguing AGAINST the very matters for which they are now petitioning.

But they had neither the vision nor motivation to do so. Instead, technology has opened the windows in the house of tele-communication. This is an airing-out long overdue. At this point in time, however, it is little more than the winds of change.

As an economic matter within the United States, the numbers of individuals using this type of computer software is steadily growing. The total, however, represents a very small portion of the tele-communications marketplace. The software itself has yet to be fully-developed. It will take years for such software to find the wide-spread use and mature development which will force changes within the tele-communications industry. This is sufficient time for all tele-communications companies to adjust their enterprises accordingly. Such changes will then occur from the natural forces of evolving technology & free enterprise, not from government intervention or regulation, and certainly not from taxation.

As an international matter, recent decisions by various U.S. government agencies regarding international call-back providers can serve as source for considering this petition. Those decisions clearly reveal that this ACTA petition is without merit.

Please consider the above in your review of these matters.

Ira Brickman
Middle Island, NY

Don't Forget To Visit Ambit - The Web Waystation:

<http://www.geocities.com/SiliconValley/1080/>

CC: 'sandy@von.org' <sandy@von.org>

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

From: <RogErick@aol.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775),FCCMAIL.SMTP("vonyes@pulver.com")
Date: 3/26/96 3:31pm
Subject: Re: Voice On the Net Coalition Digest V1 #12

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

TO: RM No. 8775... Kevin Werbach, FCC

I would like to know by what authority the FCC would regulate any internet material and/or providers.

It seems to me that any agency of government, in order to act against any individual citizen, must first show who is being hurt, and who protected. Then must show the intended result of the action, to protect, or to defend the Constitutional authority I am requesting.

It seems to me that the First Ammendment is pretty clear. To classify any internet providers or subscribers, would be a 'collectivist' rather than an 'individual' approach. Are all, as a collective, once again, to pay for the 'sins' of a few?

Also, the First Ammendment is not the only law applying. For example, Does one have 'expectation of privacy', in this medium? To security of papers and effects, as private, except by due process duly obtained by warrant and oath or affirmation, etc.?

If not, Why not?

Is speech digitally transmitted different from analog multiplexed speech(also electronically altered for efficiency in transmission) common on all phone lines?

I would like to hear back from you on source of authority -and intent to 'accomplish...?'- of this regulation, and how electronic speech differs from written, spoken, and other forms of communicatioin, in the legislation being considered.

Why am I taking an active interest?

I have lately had many grave concerns that the Federal government is growing far too large and intrusive, and seemingly acting many times. within many agencies, without regard to constitutional authority, or long-term public welfare, expanding laws to cover every possible human interaction, with the (obvious?) eventual consequence of enslaving us all to the will of a few, at the cost of cornucopian diversity, inovation, and adaptability of all individual citizens, as evidenced by the fall of the USSR.

Roger Erickson, Rojan Engineering

No. of Copies rec'd 1
FBI CODE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

From: <mnorth@infonorth.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 3:34pm
Subject: ACTA action:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

With respect to the ACTA matter:

FCC should consider actually encouraging ACTA members to get into the Voice on the Net market. Less regulation, rather than more. This genie is out of the bottle, and will be the subject of foreign competition, using U.S.-developed technology, if U.S. companies do not take the initiative.

A new industry is born, an offshoot of two existing industries, both pioneered in the U.S....creating new American businesses, new jobs, a new tax base. Federal gov't levies, if any, on VON software, hardware and bandwidth services should be targeted to encouraging universal access, as recommended by the NII.

=====

Michael North
North Communications, Los Angeles
public access multimedia networks
MNorth@infonorth.com <http://www.infonorth.com>

=====

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: <batman@mexia.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 6:00pm
Subject: RE RM8775 from Web Page form

Date: Tue, 26 Mar 1996 23:00:10 GMT
Referer: <http://www.mexia.com/fcc.html>

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

MyOpinion Leave the Internet unregulated!
i am a police officer i find the internet one of the few
places to retrieve info and talk to other officers around
world. regulation would be a pity and hurt professionals and
educators alike.

MyOpinion Submit Your Opinion

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: <dewdrop@mexia.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 7:08pm
Subject: RE RM8775 from Web Page form

Date: Wed, 27 Mar 1996 00:08:00 GMT
Referer: <http://www.mexia.com/fcc.html>

MyOpinion Some regulation of content is necessary, but stay out of pricing!

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: <dewdrop@mexia.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 7:14pm
Subject: RE RM8775 from Web Page form

Date: Wed, 27 Mar 1996 00:14:20 GMT
Referer: <http://www.mexia.com/fcc.html>

MyOpinion Some regulation of content is necessary, but stay out of pricing!

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Dave Austin <daustin@smart.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/26/96 11:02pm
Subject: RM #8775

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

To: FCC
Subject: comments on RM. #8775

I recently became aware of the issue covered by RM. 8775 and I would like to offer the following comments and observations. Before I offer my comments I would like to introduce myself.

I am a recently retired SES executive with 32 years of telecommunications experience for the National Security Agency. I was responsible of planing and projects for major telecommunications and information processing. I was specifically involved in understanding the development of communications and communications trends in the US and in a global environment. As such, I studied specifically the development of fiber optics and the Internet. I was the agency representative on National Communications System Committee of Principals, I took early retirement so I could concentrate on exploiting the new telecommunications opportunities brought about by the new laws and policies. My specific interest is in exploiting the internet for the purpose of education, distance learning for millions of people who can not afford much more that a personal computer and a local POTS phone call. I am specifically interested in seeing a distance learning and a educational mentoring industry develop which would provide affordable distance education, conferencing, training services to the average American in the intercity or rural America. I am affiliated with a non profit who is developing training content in response to the President Clinton challenge to make America competitive in the global economy of Information technology dominated products and services. This non profit is working with the Dept. of Labor in and attempt to bring relevant skill based content to people who are finding their skills in need of updating.(life long learning) It appears we can deliver skill modules across the internet for the price of a Block Buster Movie.

I am afraid if the FCC prohibits or changes prematurely the rules which allows the use of the newly available internet phone and interactive video over a dialed up internet phone call that you will kill off the efforts in distance learning that are necessary to reach, by 2000, the goals President Clinton and Vice President Gore have been advocating private industry and creative minds to pursue. The action the Telcos are asking the FCC to take will seriously curtail the ability of reaching the very people that we have previously set up funds for universal POTS access. We are at the forefront of having private industry respond with capability which will be available to everyone in the US. The Telcos are claiming the internet phone technology will seriously deplete the funds created for universal access. I submit that any depletion of the universal fund from the use of internet phones will be minor for the next few years (in fact many folks I know add another phone line to their house almost doubling their local phone bill, I have not seen the Telcos account for that additional revenue) . However, we risk killing off developments of new educational services for the same population which is helped by the current universal service fund if the FCC goes along with the Telcos proposal. In other words the country will be in much greater danger because new educational products and services will not be available if the FCC prematurely limits the development and deployment of internet phone technology.

I have tried to make my comments short as I know you will be getting a lot of comments. If my comments are of interest to you I would be willing to be an expert witness in any hearings you may have.

David Austin
3337 Leritz Lane
Edgewater, Md 21037
phone 410 798 0563
email Daustin@smart.net

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Scott Hoffman <shoffman@redshift.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/27/96 1:05am
Subject: RM-8775

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Please do NOT allow these provisions to be implemented! It is ingenuity and freedom of speech at work. These new methods only help the average consumer communicate in a more free and unregulated manner. It is merely data transfer through the internet. Are we going to open up a can of worms that allows everyone to be charged by the bit or byte? I urge you to NOT allow for regulation of data transfers using the internet.

Thank you,

Scott Hoffman &:^)
Monterey, California
shoffman@redshift.com
sch2@pge.com

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: bcwinsett <afn11300@afn.org>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 3/27/96 6:41am
Subject: Electronic telephony

MAR 27 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

As a citizen feel I must let you know our feelings on the issue of electronic telephony.

Hope you will give it some serious thought and not give the telephone companies a monopoly. We are in a new era and should NOT discourage new technology.

We don't want to have to fly on prop planes when jets are available. We'd like to have a choice.

Betty Winsett

bcwinsett For Packing and Photo tips as well as other
useful travel and internet information:
<http://www.afn.org/~afn11300/>

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1996

From: uid no body <nobody@huka.dc.id1.com>
To: A16.A16(KIDSTV)
Date: 3/26/96 5:06pm
Subject: SPECTRUM AUCTION

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DEAR SIRs:

THIS REALLY ANGERS ME. I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT HAS THE RIGHT TO AUCTION OFF SOMETHING THAT WAS NEVER THEIRS IN THE FIRST PLACE. AIR, AND AIRWAVES BELONG TO EVERYONE IN THE WORLD, NOT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT. BEING CHARGED FOR THE USE OF AIR? IT IS RIDICULOUS AND UNNECESSARY. SO WHAT IF THE GOVERNMENT MADE 8 BILLION DOLLARS OFF AN AUCTION OF PUBLIC AIRWAVES? AGAIN, IT ALL COMES DOWN TO MONEY. THEY SAY THAT IT WOULD BE HARD TO EXPLAIN THE "GIVEAWAY" OF PUBLIC AIRWAVES WORTH MILLIONS OF DOLLARS. HOW WOULD YOU EXPLAIN TO THE TAXPAYERS THAT THEIR LOCAL NEWS IS TO BE NO MORE BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENT WANTED TO MAKE A LITTLE CASH OFF THE DEAL. THIS AUCTION WOULD DRIVE THE SMALL MARKET BROADCASTERS OUT OF BUSINESS, RESULTING IN THE LOSS OF JOBS. ESPECIALLY FOR PEOPLE LIKE ME, WHO WORK IN THE BUSINESS OF TELEVISION COMMUNICATION. IF SOMEONE WOULD PLEASE EXPLAIN TO ME WHO BENEFITS FROM THIS DEAL, EXCEPT THE GOVERNMENT, THEN MAYBE I WOULD UNDERSTAND AND POSSIBLY EVEN SYMPATHIZE. YOU ARE DRIVING THE SAME PEOPLE OUT OF BUSINESS WHO RUN YOUR CAMPAIGN ADS WHEN YOUR TIME COMES FOR RE-ELECTION. HOW CAN MUCH TIME CAN YOU AFFORD TO PAY FOR ON A STATION WHO BROADCASTS FROM DENVER TO SHOW THE NEWS IN NORTH DAKOTA? THE LITTLE PEOPLE IN THIS BUSINESS ARE THE ONES WHO GET YOU ELECTED. I HOPE THAT WHEN THE TIME COMES TO MAKE THIS DECISION, THAT YOU WILL MAKE THE ONE THAT KEEPS PEOPLE LIKE ME WORKING.

SINCERELY,
HEIDI GRONDAHL
WILLISTON, ND

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____